UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,915	11/13/2003	Hye Jeong Jeon	24286/81451	7327

7590 10/19/2006

Peter H. Kang
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
Suite 2000
555 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715

EXAMINER	
DEBROW, JAMES J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/705,915	JEON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James J. Debrow	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *26,28-56 and 58-80* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *26,28-56 and 58-80* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/7/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 07 Aug. 2006.

2. Claims 26, 28-56, and 58-80 are pending in this case. Claims 26, 36, 46, 47, 57, 58, 69, and 70 are independent claim.

Applicant's Response

3. Applicant amended claims 26, 28-32, 35-40, 43, 45-56, 68-78, and 80; canceled claim 57; argues all previous objections and rejections.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Specification does not disclose the terms "lower element", and "upper element" as recited in claims (see independent claims along with appropriate dependent claims).

Claim Objections

5. **Claim 28** is objected to because of the following informalities: This claim recites the term "lower element". The specification makes no mention of a "lower element", however the specification recites the term "lower structure". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. **Claim 28** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim recites the terms "*lower element*" and "*upper element*". It is unclear to the examiner as to how applicant identifies/distinguishes the "*lower element* " of a document from the "*upper element*" of the document. Clarification is required in the matter.

8. **Claims 40- 42, 52- 54, 63-65, and 75-77** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims recite the terms "*lower structure* " and "*upper structure*". It is unclear to the examiner as to how applicant identifies/distinguishes the "*lower element* " of a document from the "*upper element*" of the document. Clarification is required in the matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 26, 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Azami et al. (Pub. No.: 2003/0009472 A1; Filing Date: Jul. 9, 2001)(hereinafter "Azami") in view of Kim et al. (Pub. No.: 2004/0015369 A1; Filing Date: Aug. 9, 2002) (hereinafter "Kim") further in view of Anderson et al. (Patent No.: 5,499,365; Patent Date: Mar. 12, 1996))(hereinafter "Anderson").**

In regards to independent claim 26, Azami disclose *a document management system, comprising:*

a document storage device configured to store at least one XML electronic documents describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and comprising an upper element and a lower element (0004-0005; 0087-0089; 0203-0204; Fig. 25; Azami discloses a storage device for storing XML metadata files/documents consisting of upper and lower ranked structures relating to a broadcasting program.).

Azami does not disclose expressly *a document receiving device coupled to the document storage device, wherein the document receiving device is configured to process one of multiple versions of the XML electronic document according to a version value of the versions of the XML electronic document.*

However, Kim discloses *a document receiving device coupled to the document storage device, wherein the document receiving device is configured to process one of multiple versions of the XML electronic document according to a version value of the versions of the XML electronic document,* (0009 lines 1-4 & 9-13; 0046 lines 5-6; Kim discloses a database for storing documents and managing the different versions of the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Azami, in view of Kim, for the benefit a transmission/receiving system, such as a digital television broadcast system, to be able to identifying the units *(electronic document)* by referring to the identification information *(version value)* (0202-0203).

Azami, in view of Kim, does not expressly disclose/teach *data information and time information of contents of the XML, electronic document are used as the version value.*

However, Anderson discloses *data information and time information of contents of the XMl, electronic document are used as the version value* (column 2, lines 30-39;

column 6, lines 30-50; Anderson teaches a version identifier such as a version times is converted into a sequence value.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Azami, in view of Kim, with Anderson for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regards to dependent claim 28, Azami discloses structured metadata file description of a tree structured is separated or divided at an arbitrary position into upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata. Azami further discloses the upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata are connected and integrated into the original structured metadata (0087-0089).

Azami in view of Kim does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 26, wherein a lower element version value is updated when content of a lower element of the XML electronic document is changed, and wherein the updated element fragment version value is used as a corresponding upper element version value.*

However, Anderson discloses *the document management system of claim 26, wherein a lower element version value is updated when content of a lower element of*

the XML electronic document is changed, and wherein the updated element fragment version value is used as a corresponding upper element version value. (column 9, lines 19-24; Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Azami in view of Kim with Anderson for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 29, Azami in view of Kim does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 26, wherein each element version value includes date and time information according to when said contents of the corresponding element was updated.*

However, Anderson discloses *the document management system of claim 26, wherein each element version value includes date and time information according to when said contents of the corresponding element was updated* (column 2, lines 30-39; column 6, lines 30-50).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Azami in view of Kim with Anderson for the benefit

maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 30, Azami discloses *the document management system of claim 26, wherein the document receiving device is configured to request the XML documents* (0005-0006).

In regard to dependent claim 31, Azami in view of Kim does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 29, wherein said each element version value includes date and time information when contents of the corresponding element was changed.*

However, Anderson discloses *the document management system of claim 29, wherein said each element version value includes date and time information when contents of the corresponding element was changed* (column 2, lines 30-39; column 6, lines 30-50; *Anderson teaches a version identifier such as a version times is converted into a sequence value.*).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Azami in view of Kim with Anderson for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 32, Azami in view of Kim does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 28, wherein a type of the content of the lower element is included in the upper element version value.*

However, Anderson teaches *the document management system of claim 28, wherein a type of the content of the lower element is included in the upper element version value* (column 9, lines 19-24; Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Azami in view of Kim with Anderson for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 33, Azami discloses *the document management system of claim 26, wherein version information of said contents is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said electronic document* (0004-0006).

In regard to dependent claim 34, Azami discloses the document management system of claim 33, wherein said syntax is XML schema (0004-0006).

In regard to dependent claim 35, Azami discloses *the document management system of claim 34, wherein said contents includes at least one number selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of said broadcasting television program* (0199).

Note

11. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

12. **Claims 36-39, 46-51, 58-62, and 69-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Barker et al. (Pub. No.: 2002/0143976 A1; Filing Date: Mar. 9, 2001)(hereinafter "Barker").**

In regard to independent claim 36, Anderson discloses *wherein each element is based on XML, a method for updating one of the element stored in a client, the method comprising:*

wherein said element version comprises date information and/or time information (column 6, lines 30-31; column 7, lines 26-32)*;*

updating said element stored in said client with said received updated version of said element and without replacing the electronic document in its entirety (column 2, lines 40-65; Anderson teaches the concept of only selecting/identifying objects with a specific version value. Thus, *receiving updated version of said element and without replacing the electronic document in its entirety*).

Anderson does not disclose expressly *requesting an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program;*

receiving said updated version of said element, wherein said updated version is identified by a element identification including an element version.

However, Barker teaches *for an electronic document describing metadata related to broadcasting program:*

requesting an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program (0010; 0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider receiving a request for updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program.);

receiving said updated version of said element, wherein said updated version is identified by a element identification including an element version (0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider sending updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program in response to a request from an endpoint.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 37, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 36, wherein each said element version includes date and time information according to when contents of the element were updated* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 38, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 37, wherein said element version includes date and time information according to when said contents of the element were changed* (column 6, lines 45-47).

In regard to dependent claim 39, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 36, wherein said requesting comprises transmitting a current version of said element, and wherein said element version of said received updated version is later than an element version of said current version* (column 7, lines 65-66 Anderson discloses an extract sequence attribute, which when is greater than the selection sequence attribute, indicated a later version).

In regard to independent claim 46, Anderson discloses *updating said element stored in said client with a version later than a version of said element stored in said client and without replacing the electronic document in its entirety* (column 2, lines 40-65; Anderson teaches the concept of only selecting/identifying objects with a specific version value. Thus, *receiving updated version of said element and without replacing the electronic document in its entirety.), wherein said element version comprises date information and/or time information* (column 6, lines 30-31; column 7, lines 26-32).

Anderson does not disclose expressly *requesting from a provider an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program;*

wherein said later version is identified by an element identification including an element version from said provider.

However, Barker discloses *for an electronic document describing metadata related to broadcasting program:*

requesting from a provider an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program (0010; 0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider receiving a request for updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program.).

wherein said later version is identified by an element identification including an element version from said provider (0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider sending updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program in response to a request from an endpoint.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to independent claim 47, Anderson discloses *updating said element stored in said client with a version later than a version of said element stored in said client and without replacing the electronic document in its entirety* (column 2, lines 40-

65; Anderson teaches the concept of only selecting/identifying objects with a specific version value. Thus, *receiving updated version of said element and without replacing the electronic document in its entirety, wherein said element version comprises date information and/or time information* (column 6, lines 30-31; column 7, lines 26-32).

Further, Barker teaches *for an electronic document describing metadata related to broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML, a method for processing a response to a request for updating one of the elements stored in a client.* (0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider sending updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program in response to a request from an endpoint.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson with Barker for the benefit of enabling the asset provider to send the updated metadata to one or more distribution endpoints making the request (0012).

In regard to dependent claim 48, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 47, comprising receiving said updated version of said element identified by said element identification and said element version from a provider* (column 7, lines 26-32 Anderson discloses a version selection request for an object (element) is identified based upon the logical key (version). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art that the provider would typically supply the updated element along with it's element version of the that is transmitted to the client).

In regard to dependent claim 49, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 47, wherein each element version includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the element were updated* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 50, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 49, wherein said each element version includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the element were changed* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 51, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 47, wherein said request comprises a selected version of said element, and wherein said received updated version of said element is later than said selected version* (column 7, lines 65-66 Anderson discloses an extract sequence attribute, which when is greater than the selection sequence attribute, indicated a later version).

In regard to independent claim 58, Anderson does not expressly disclose *for an electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML, a method for providing an updated version of one of the elements, the method comprising:*

receiving a request from a client for the updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program;

determining whether a provider has a capability of handling said request for the updated version; and

supplying said updated version of said element in accordance with a determined result, wherein said updated version is identified by an element identification including an element version, wherein said element version is date information and/or time information.

However, Barker teaches *receiving a request from a client for the updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program* (0010; 0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider receiving a request for updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program.).

determining whether a provider has a capability of handling said request for the updated version (0025-0029).

supplying said updated version of said element in accordance with a determined result, wherein said updated version is identified by an element identification including an element version, wherein said element version is date information and/or time information (0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider sending updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program in response to a request from an endpoint.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 59, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 58, wherein said request for said updated version of said element identifies said element using element identification and a current element version* (column 7, lines 26-32 Anderson discloses a version selection request for an object (element) is identified based upon the logical key (version). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the provider would typically supply the updated element along with it's element version of the that is transmitted to the client).

In regard to dependent claim 60, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 58, comprising identifying a version of said element later than a requested version of said element in said provider as said updated version of said element* (column 7, lines 65-66 Anderson discloses an extract sequence attribute, which when is greater than the selection sequence attribute, indicated a later version).

In regard to dependent claim 61, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 58, wherein each element t version includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the element were updated* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 62, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 61, wherein said each element version includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the element were changed* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to independent claim 69, Anderson discloses *supplying said client with an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata, wherein said element version is date information and/or time information* (column 6, lines 30-50).

Anderson does not expressly disclose *for an electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML,a method for replying to a request for updating one of the elements stored in a client, the method comprising:*

supplying said client with an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program, wherein the updated version is identified by an element identification including an element version.

However, Barker teaches *for an electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML,a method for replying to a request for updating one of the elements stored in a client, the method comprising:*

supplying said client with an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program, wherein the updated version is identified by an element identification including an element version (0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider sending updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program in response to a request from an endpoint.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to independent claim 70, Anderson discloses *using version information of said element of the electronic document describing metadata wherein said version comprises date information and/or time information* (column 6, lines 30-50).

Anderson does not expressly disclose *for an electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML, a method for managing one of the element stored in a client describing metadata related on a television broadcasting program, the method comprising:*

using a version information of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to the television broadcasting program.

However, Barker teaches *using version information of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to the television broadcasting program* (0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider sending updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program in response to a request from an endpoint.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 71, Anderson does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 70, comprising transmitting updated versions of said element identified by said element information including at least said element version information.*

However, Barker teaches *the method of claim 70, comprising transmitting updated versions of said element identified by said element information including at least said element version information* (0025-0029; Barker discloses an asset provider sending updated metadata relating to a broadcasting program in response to a request from an endpoint.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 72, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 71, wherein each element version information includes date and time information according to when said metadata of said element were updated* (column 6, lines 30-50).

In regard to dependent claim 73, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 72, wherein said each element version information includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the element were changed* (column 6, lines 30-50).

In regard to dependent claim 74, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 71, comprising receiving a request for an updated version of said element* (column 7, lines 26-38).

13. **Claims 40-45, 52-56, 63-68, 75-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Barker, further in view of Azami.**

In regard to dependent claim 40, Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version (column 9, lines 19-24).

Anderson in view of Barker does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 36, wherein said element comprises an upper structure and a lower structure in hierarchical arrangement, wherein when a lower structure of said element is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of said upper structure.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 36, wherein said element comprises an upper structure and a lower structure in hierarchical arrangement, wherein when said lower structure of said element is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of said upper structure* (0087-0089; Azami teaches structured metadata file description of a tree structured is separated or divided at an arbitrary position into upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata. Azami further discloses the upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata are connected and integrated into the original structured metadata.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit

of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 41, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 40, wherein a largest value of the version values of the lower structures is used as the version value of the upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24; Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version.).

In regard to dependent claim 42, Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version (column 9, lines 19-24).

Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 41, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the upper structure.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 41, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the upper structure* (0087-0089; Azami teaches structured metadata file description of a tree structured is separated or divided at an arbitrary position into upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata. Azami further discloses the upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank

structured metadata are connected and integrated into the original structured metadata.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 43, Anderson in view of Barker does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 37, wherein said element version of said contents is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said element.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 37, wherein said element version of said contents is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said element* (0004-0006).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 44, Anderson in view of Barker does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 43, wherein said syntax is XML schema.*

However, Azami teaches *the document management system of claim 33, wherein said syntax is XML schema* (0004-0006).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 45, Anderson does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 44, wherein said contents includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program.*

However, Barker teaches *the document management system of claim 34, wherein said contents includes at least one number selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a broadcasting television program* (0024-0025).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson with Barker for the benefit of enabling the asset provider to send the updated metadata to one or more distribution endpoints making the request (0012).

In regard to dependent claim 52, Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version (column 9, lines 19-24).

Anderson in view of Barker does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 47, wherein said element comprises an upper structure and a lower structure in hierarchical arrangement, wherein when a lower structure of said element is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of said upper structure.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 47, wherein said element comprises an upper structure and a lower structure in hierarchical arrangement wherein when a lower structure of said element is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of said upper structure* (0087-0089; Azami teaches structured metadata file description of a tree structured is separated or divided at an arbitrary position into upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata. Azami further discloses the upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata are connected and integrated into the original structured metadata.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit

of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 53, Anderson teaches as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version (column 9, lines 19-24).

Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 52, wherein a largest value of the version values of the lower structures is used as the version value of the corresponding upper structure.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 52, wherein a largest value of the version values of the lower structures is used as the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (0087-0089; Azami teaches structured metadata file description of a tree structured is separated or divided at an arbitrary position into upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata. Azami further discloses the upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata are connected and integrated into the original structured metadata.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit

of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 54, Anderson teaches as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version (column 9, lines 19-24).

Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 53, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 53, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (0087-0089; Azami teaches structured metadata file description of a tree structured is separated or divided at an arbitrary position into upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata. Azami further discloses the upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata are connected and integrated into the original structured metadata.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit

of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 55, Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 47, wherein said fragment version is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said element, and wherein said syntax is XML schema.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 47, wherein said element version is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said* element, *and wherein said syntax is XML schema* (0004-0006).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 56, Anderson *does not disclose expressly the method of claim 47, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program.*

However, Barker teaches *the document management system of claim 34, wherein said contents includes at least one number selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a broadcasting television program* (0024-0025).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson with Barker for the benefit of enabling the asset provider to send the updated metadata to one or more distribution endpoints making the request (0012).

In regard to dependent claim 63, Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version (column 9, lines 19-24).

Anderson in view of Barker does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 58. wherein said element comprises an upper structure and a lower structure in hierarchical arrangement, wherein when a lower structure of said element is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of a corresponding upper structure.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 58, wherein said element comprises an upper structure and a lower structure in hierarchical arrangement, wherein when a lower structure of said element is changed, a version value of the lower*

structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of a corresponding upper structure (0087-0089; Azami teaches structured metadata file description of a tree structured is separated or divided at an arbitrary position into upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata. Azami further discloses the upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata are connected and integrated into the original structured metadata.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 64, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 63, wherein a largest value of the version values of the lower structures is used as the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24; Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version.).

In regard to dependent claim 65, Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version (column 9, lines 19-24).

Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 64, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 64, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (0087-0089; Azami teaches structured metadata file description of a tree structured is separated or divided at an arbitrary position into upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata. Azami further discloses the upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata are connected and integrated into the original structured metadata.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 66, Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 58, wherein said element version is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said element.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 58, wherein said element version is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said element* (0004-0006).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 67, Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 66, wherein said syntax is XML schema.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 66, wherein said syntax is XML schema* (0004-0006).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 68, Anderson does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 67, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program.*

However, Barker teaches *the method of claim 67, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program* (0024-0025).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson with Barker for the benefit of enabling the asset provider to send the updated metadata to one or more distribution endpoints making the request (0012).

In regard to dependent claim 75, Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version (column 9, lines 19-24).

Anderson in view of Barker does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 70, wherein when a lower' structure of said element is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of a corresponding upper structure.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 70, wherein when a lower' structure of said element is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of a corresponding upper structure* (0087-0089; Azami teaches structured metadata file description of a tree

structured is separated or divided at an arbitrary position into upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata. Azami further discloses the upper-rank structure metadata and lower-rank structured metadata are connected and integrated into the original structured metadata.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 76, Anderson discloses *the method of claim 75, wherein a largest value of the version values of the lower structures is used as the version value of the corresponding upper structure* column 9, lines 19-24; Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version.).

In regard to dependent claim 77, Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version (column 9, lines 19-24).

Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 76, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 76, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24; Anderson teach as revisions are made, the extracted sequence of the old version is updated to match the insert sequence number of new version.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 78, Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 70, wherein said element version information is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said element.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 70, wherein said element version information is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said element* (0004-0006).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 79, Anderson in view of Barker does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 78, wherein said syntax is XML schema.*

However, Azami teaches *the method of claim 78, wherein said syntax is XML schema* (0004-0006).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson in view of Barker with Azami for the benefit of maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time.

In regard to dependent claim 80, Anderson does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 79, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program.*

However, Barker teaches *the method of claim 79, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program* (0024-0025).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson with Barker for the benefit of enabling the asset provider to send the updated metadata to one or more distribution endpoints making the request (0012).

Note

14. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 07 Aug. 2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 26, 36, 46, 47, 58, 69,

and 70, along with their respective dependent claims, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. New ground(s) of rejection are based on newly found prior art reference(s) Azami. An explanation of the rejection is given.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100